

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**Recreation and Public Purpose Lease N-80113-01 —**  
**Change of Use of 10 Acres**

U.S. Department of Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

OFFICE: Las Vegas Field Office, LLNVS00560

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2010-0082-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Recreation and Public Purpose Lease N-80113-01

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:

This is a proposal for a change of use of 10 acres of Recreation and Public Purpose Lease (R&PP) N-80113-01. N-80113-01 was issued on April 8, 2008, with 36.48 acres designated as a park site, and 5 acres designated as a Police Facility (total 41.48 acres). This proposal is for a change of use of 10 acres of the original 36.48 acres designated for a park site to be used instead as an educational Northern STARS (Safety Training and Rescue Skills) Safety Village.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

The lease area is located in northern Las Vegas, south of the 215 Beltway, on Centennial Parkway between Statz Street and Palmer Street.

Mount Diablo Meridian, T. 19 S., R. 61 E., sec. 24, the NW¼ portion of Government Lot 12.

APPLICANT (if any):

The City of North Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada

**A. Description of Proposed Action and any application measures**

This is a proposal for a change of use of 10 acres of Recreation and Public Purpose Lease (R&PP) N-80113-01. N-80113-01 was issued on April 8, 2008, with 36.48 acres designated as a park site, and 5 acres designated as a Police Facility (total 41.48 acres). This proposal is for a change of use of 10 acres of the original 36.48 acres designated for a park site to be used instead as an educational Northern STARS (Safety Training and Rescue Skills) Safety Village.

The Northern STARS Safety Village's mission statement is to educate and enlighten the youth of southern Nevada by providing state-of-the-art hands-on life safety programs in a fun, exciting, life-learning, and memorable experience. The primary structures include a village, an amphitheater, a picnic area, a fire fighters park, education classrooms, education auditorium, administration bldg., a garage, a swimming pool, and a parking area. Safety programs include bicycle safety, emergency services, fire safety and prevention, injury prevention for seniors, internet safety, motor vehicle safety, pedestrian safety, rules of the road and water safety.

The lease area is located in northern Las Vegas, south of the 215 Beltway, on Centennial Parkway on the corner of Statz Street and Rome Blvd.

The lease will be amended to include the change of use of the 10 acres. The lease will be for a period of 25 years.

## **B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

LUP Name\* Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement Date Approved: October 1998  
*\*List Applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)*

**The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP and is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:**

The proposed action is in conformance because it is specifically provided for in Land Use Plan Decisions LD-1 and LD-2 in the approved Las Vegas Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved on October 1998.

LD-1 — “Approximately 175,314 acres of public lands within the disposal areas identified on Map 2–3 (located in the RMP plan) are potentially available for disposal through sale, exchange, or Recreation and Public Purpose patent to provide for the orderly expansion and development of southern Nevada.”

LD-2 — “All public lands within the planning area...are available at the discretion of the agency, for land use leases and permits.”

**OTHER APPLICABLE REGULATIONS AND DOCUMENTS THAT THE PROPOSED ACTION IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH:**

The Recreation and Public Purpose Lease terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 2741.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) as amended (3 U.S.C. 1701 et.seq.).

The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998, as amended (P.L. 105–263, 112 Stat 2343).

The Recreation and Public Purposes Act (68 Statute 173; 43 United States Code 869 et. seq.).

## **C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action**

Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision, signed October 5, 1998.

Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision, signed December 23, 2004.

Environmental Assessment, NEPA 2006-326, for R&PP N-80113-01, Fonsi and Decision signed on April 13, 2007, Lease Issued on April 8, 2008.

THE PROPOSED ACTION IS TIERED OFF OF:

The proposed action will DNA off of the Environmental Assessment NEPA 2006-326, for R&PP N-80113-01, Fonsi and Decision signed on April 13, 2007, Lease Issued April 8, 2008.

#### **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

The proposed action is a feature of, and similar to alternatives analyzed in environmental analysis (EA) NEPA 2006-326 for R&PP Lease N-80113, Fonsi signed on April 13, 2007.

The proposed action is in the same analysis area, and the same geographic location as the original analysis for NEPA 2006-326.

The new proposed action Plan of Development (POD) is essentially similar to the original POD park design with the addition of more buildings, more parking, and extra amenities. Differences are not substantial.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

The proposed action for a change of use of 10 acres for the R&PP Lease from a park to an educational Safety Village does not change the alternatives analyzed in the original NEPA document. The addition of more buildings, parking lot and amenities will not change alternative actions. The range of alternatives are appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests and resource values.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

The area is located in the northern part of the Las Vegas Valley. The tortoise concerns for that area were met in the original EA analyses. Tortoise Mitigation fees have been paid by the proponent. The area has since included more housing and development in the area, thus minimizing the tortoise entry, and minimizing the endangered plant and animal species in the area.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

The change of use from a park which included buildings, restroom, pool, parking, playground, to the addition of more buildings, parking, and amenities is not different enough to cause a change to the cumulative effects, either direct, or indirect. The cumulative effects as analyzed in the original EA remain the same.

**5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

The public involvement and reviews were completed in the previous analysis, under NEPA 2006–236. A NORA was completed, and the report was entered into the Federal Register, and newspapers. Public involvement regulations were followed per the FLPMA Act of 1976, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, revised August 1996, and per 43 CFR 2741.

Public involvement and interagency reviews for the site area were completed in the analysis for the Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision signed December 23,2004.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

**Note**

Refer to the environmental analysis completed for N-80113, NEPA 2006–236, and the NORA and public comments included in casefile N-80113, for a complete list of the team members and public who participated in the preparation of the previous environmental analyses or planning documents. This DNA was reviewed and analyzed by the BLM Las Vegas Field Office Resource Specialists shown below.

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Fred Edwards	BLM Botanist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Suzanne Rowe	BLM Archaeologist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
George Varhalmi	BLM Geologist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Lucas J. Rhea	BLM, Fire Management	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Lisa Christianson	BLM Enviromental Spec.	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Mike Moran	BLM Hazmat Specialist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Lauren Brown	BLM Botanist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office

Nora Caplette	BLM Weeds	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Chris Linehan	BLM Recreation Specialist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Sarah Peterson	BLM Hydrologist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Susan Farkas	BLM Environmental Specialist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Mark Slaughter	BLM Wildlife Biologist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Sendi Kalcic	BLM Wilderness Specialist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office
Dorothy J. Dickey	BLM Realty Specialist	BLM, Las Vegas Field Office

**Conclusion**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

  
 Project Lead: Dorothy Jean Dickey, Realty Specialist

*FOR*   
 Beth Ransel, Acting Assistant Field Manager,  
 Division of Lands

7-1-10  
 Date

**Note:**

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.